

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 as being obvious over the admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,888 to Manohar.

I. THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

According to the Examiner, the admitted prior art is described in Figs. 4 and 5 and pages 1-9 of the application, and discloses each element of the claimed invention, except for cooling the auxiliary cooling circuit and the gas cooler with the same cooling fluid (as in claim 3).

To satisfy this missing element, the Examiner cites the disclosure Manohar of cooling fluid 238 cooling both gas cooler 224b and auxiliary cooling circuit 224a. The Examiner argues that it would be obvious to modify the admitted prior art to include this element of Manohar. According to the Examiner, the “location of the gas cooler downstream of the auxiliary cooling circuit would have been obvious.”

II. APPLICANTS' RESPONSE

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants' claimed invention differs from conventional systems because of the limitation in claim 1 that the “auxiliary cooling circuit has substantially the same ventilation area as that of the gas cooler.” This is the basis for the statement at the top of page 9 of the present specification that in conventional systems, microtubes of the gas cooler in the exchange and the microtubes of the inter cooler have different shapes, causing increased manufacturing costs. This feature of the present invention is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art.

The attention of the Examiner is directed to the description of the claimed invention which appears in the discussion of the background of the invention (3:10-5:11), where it is

• Response under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
• Attorney Docket No. 042102
Serial No. 10/777,220

compared to conventional systems (5:12-8:14). Additionally, Fig. 2 showing the claimed invention and Fig. 4 showing the prior art are distinguishable for this reason.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Scott M. Daniels

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32,562

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SMD/cas